

REMARKS

Formal Drawings are enclosed herewith to replace the informal drawings originally submitted. No changes are intended.

In the previous office action, the examiner indicated that claims 4-6 and 8-16 would be allowable if placed in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. That has been done and the rejected claims 1-3 and 7 have been canceled. Therefore, the claims are now believed allowable.

In the first sentence of the office action, the examiner said that a sketch of the system described on page 4, lines 12-18 of the specification should be supplied. That is believed both impossible, because of the sequence of events described below, and unnecessary for the reasons stated below.

The inventor prepared his own written descriptions of the invention that were given to applicant's undersigned attorney. The inventor's descriptions included, nearly verbatim, the language cited by the examiner. Applicant's undersigned attorney then took those documents and merged and edited them into a provisional application and retained the cited language. However, applicant's attorney is unfamiliar with the structure that the inventor was describing in the cited language but did discuss the prior art generally with the inventor. After filing the provisional application, the undersigned attorney took the provisional application and added other text and claims in consultation with the inventor and prepared the non-provisional patent application. The same language was again retained, not only to disclose prior art that the inventor apparently was aware of but also to prevent being accused of withholding something.

On July 8, 2004, the undersigned attorney was informed that the inventor had died and consequently is no longer available to ask what he was referring to. The death of the inventor is what makes it impossible to know what the inventor was referring to.

Applicant's attorney has studied the cited language and tried to recall his discussions of the prior art with the inventor. Although there is some uncertainty in the language, applicant's attorney believes he acquired a fairly good idea of what was meant. Applicant's attorney then asked a successor principal of the assignee company about what the cited language was referring to. He too did not know. Applicant's attorney described his theory of what was meant, and the principal agreed that it was likely accurate, although he knew of no one who did what we think the inventor was describing.

Applicant's attorney believes that the cited language is referring to something very similar in concept to the structures shown in the prior art cited by the examiner. Therefore, it is believed unnecessary to provide sketches because it is believed that the cited art shows the concepts. Furthermore, any supplied sketch would only incorporate the speculation of applicant's attorney about what was meant.

A reading of the cited language suggests to applicant's attorney that this prior art structure described by the inventor was simply a piece of coaxial cable with a coaxial connector at one end, with the cable passing through a fitting connected to a piece of conduit with some kind of sealant between the interior wall of the fitting and the outer, insulating cover that surrounds the outer cylindrical conductor of the cable. This is the kind of thing shown in the Wayman, Howarth and Yamazaki references. The exterior of the conduit fitting may also have been sealed, analogous to applying a sealant to the

threads of the Wayman reference, cited by the examiner. The cable extended from an antenna connection on the circuitry inside the explosion proof enclosure and then ran away from that enclosure, possibly entirely through conduit, to a remote antenna displaced from that enclosure, as stated in the cited language. Applicant's attorney believes that is what was intended but recognizes that this is an educated guess based upon a reading of the language and recollections of discussions with the inventor more than a year ago.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that it is impossible to provide a sketch of what the inventor was referring to because of the death of the inventor and it is unnecessary because the prior art shows essentially the same thing, to the best of the ability of applicant's attorney to figure it out.


Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The examiner is authorized to communicate with the undersigned attorney by email by the following recommended authorization language: Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file. (authorization pursuant to MPEP 502.03)

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 13-3393 for any insufficient fees under 37 CFR §§ 1.16 or 1.17, or credit any overpayment of fees.

Respectfully submitted,

9/9/05
Date of Signature



Frank H. Foster,
Reg. No. 24,560
KREMBLAS, FOSTER, PHILLIPS & POLLICK
7632 Slate Ridge Blvd.
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
Voice: 614/575-2100
Fax: 614/575-2149
email: ffoster@ohiopatent.com

Last printed 9/8/2005 11:55 AM
I:\client.docs\analynk - analx\100 explosion proof antenna\response1.doc